

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of

BANDO, Kazuaki

Atty. Ref.: 1207-116; Confirmation No. 4363

Appl. No. 10/529,384

TC/A.U. 3723

Filed: March 28, 2005

Examiner: Robert J. Scruggs

For: GLASS-PLATE WORKING APPARATUS

\* \* \* \* \*

July 2, 2008

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Responsive to the Official Action dated January 2, 2008, (for which petition is hereby made for a three month extension of time), Applicant requests reconsideration of the above-identified application based on the following remarks.

Claims 13-15, 17-21, 23 and 24 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bovone (U.S. Patent No. 5,433,657) in view of Ercole et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,848,005) and Bando (U.S. Patent No. 5,396,736). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13 and 19 are directed to a glass-plate working apparatus comprising arranging means or an arranging device which includes a suction cup lifting device equipped to the supporting means or the grinder support to raise the suction cup, and a transporting means or transporter which includes one lifting device for raising the glass-plate to be carried in, another

lifting device for raising the glass-plate on the suction cup to be carried out, and a slider to which the suction cup lifting device, said one lifting device and said other lifting device are attached, and which is linearly movable in one direction.

According to the glass-plate working apparatus of claim 13 and claim 19, it is not necessary to install individually a slider for moving a glass-plate and a separate slider for moving a suction cup. Accordingly, Applicant's disclosure shows that it is possible to simplify the structure of the glass-plate working apparatus. There is no reasoned teaching or suggestion as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the Bovone, Ercole et al. or Bando to include a slider to which the suction cup lifting device, the one lifting device and the other lifting device are attached, and which is linearly movable in one direction. Any motivation to modify the teachings of the applied prior art to arrive at this subject matter is based on impermissible hindsight, which is not the proper foundation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 22 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bovone, Ercole et al. and Bando, and further in view of Monforte (U.S. Patent No. 4,809,425). However, claims 16 and 22 are patentable by virtue of their dependence on claims 13 and 19, respectively, and for the additional features they recite. Monforte does not make up for the deficiencies noted above in respect to Bovone, Ercole et al. and Bando.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-15, 17-21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bando in view of Bovone and Ercole et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons noted above, in that none of these references teaches or suggests the subject matter of claims 13 and

19. There is no motivation to modify these references to include the claimed subject matter, absent the use of impermissible hindsight.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bando, Bovone and Ercole et al., and further in view of Monforte. However, this rejection is respectfully traversed since claims 16 and 22 depend from claims 13 and 19, respectively, and because claims 16 and 22 recite additional subject matter not found in the applied prior art references when combined with the base independent claims. In addition, Monforte does not make up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to Bando, Bovone and Ercole et al.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are patentable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Account No. 14-1140 under Order No. PTB-1207-116.

BANDO, Kazuaki  
Appl. No. 10/529,384  
July 2, 2008

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:                     /Paul T. Bowen/                      
Paul T. Bowen  
Reg. No. 38,009

PTB:jck  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100